

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CA Indosuez (Switzerland) SA v. Tedy Perin
Case No. D2026-0761

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CA Indosuez (Switzerland) SA, Switzerland, represented by id est avocats Sàrl, Switzerland.

The Respondent is TEDY PERIN, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thaler-assets.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swiss bank and part of the Crédit Agricole Group, one of Europe's largest banking groups. Following a merger in 2025, the Complainant is the legal successor of Banque Thaler SA (Bank Thaler AG), a Swiss bank seated in Geneva, Switzerland (as per Appendix 3 to the Complaint). Through the merger, the Complainant has become owner of several trademarks in the designations THALER and BANQUE THALER including the following (as per Appendix 7 to the Complaint):

- Swiss trademark registration No. 470901 THALER (word/figurative), registered on March 29, 2000, for banking and financial services in Class 36;
- Swiss trademark registration No.476020 BANQUE THALER (word/figurative), registered on September 11, 2000, for banking and financial services in Class 36;
- Swiss trademark registration No. 827352 BANQUE THALER (word/figurative), registered on February 28, 2025, for banking and financial services in Class 36.

The Complainant owns the domain names <banquethaler.ch>, and <banquethaler.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 13, 2025. At the time of filing the present Complaint, it resolved to a blank website without content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it owns rights in the trademarks THALER and BANQUE THALER. The Complainant refers to Appendix 3 which is an extract from the Swiss Official Gazette of Commerce which shows that Banque Thaler, the entity on behalf of which the trademarks according to Appendix 7 were registered, was absorbed by merger into the Complainant, thereby effecting a transfer of all intellectual property rights of BANQUE THALER including the relevant trademarks. Merely the formal steps to update the trademark registrations to the Complainant as current owner had not yet been completed. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the THALER trademark, as it includes the trademark in its entirety, supplemented by a hyphen and the additional element "assets", which, according to the Complainant, is descriptive and refers to the Complainant's field of business and therefore does not remove the likelihood of confusion.

On the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Two of the trademarks of the Complainant were registered in 2000, long before the disputed domain name was created. The Complainant finds it highly unlikely that any prior use of the Respondent exists. In addition, the disputed domain name accurately reflects the Complainant's trademark, and the addition of the reference "assets" specific to the Complainant's field of business increases the allusion of an association of the disputed domain name with the Complainant. This, so the Complainant claims, argues against the existence of a legitimate interest and demonstrates the Respondent's desire to give the illusion of an association with the Complainant. Moreover, the website, to which the disputed domain name directs, is blank.

On the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant points to the disputed domain name being identical to one of the Complainant's trademarks which, according to the Complainant is sufficient as a presumption of bad faith. The addition of the descriptive term "assets" relating to the Complainant's field of activity is, so the

Complainant states, also likely to create a presumption of bad faith. In addition, the Complainant argues that the absence of use of a disputed domain name is not incompatible with the existence of bad faith, in particular when a respondent conceals its identity. Finally, the Complainant asserts that in the banking sector lookalike domain names are primary instruments for phishing and financial fraud. Against this background, the passive holding of the disputed domain name for which there is no plausible good-faith explanation is to be considered a latent threat to the integrity of the financial system and a risk of fraud.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "assets", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name consisting of the Complainant's mark combined with the term "assets" which is a descriptive term in the banking business, meaning an economic value expected to provide future benefits and administered by a bank. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any website content.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's trademark and a descriptive term from the banking business. Taking this into consideration, the overall plausibility of any good faith use of the disputed domain name is low. Furthermore, the Respondent has failed to submit a response and provide evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use. Accordingly, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <thaler-assets.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: April 20, 2026